

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

WILLIAM E. LIEBEL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-24-894-SLP
)	
TERRI ROBERTSON, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss Doe Defendants [Doc. No. 17] filed by Plaintiff William E. Liebel. Plaintiff asks the Court “to dismiss its claim without prejudice as to the Defendants, John Doe, Occupant, and Jane Doe, Occupant (collectively, ‘Doe Defendants’), only.” Mot. at 1. The Doe Defendants have not appeared in this action.¹

Although not cited by Plaintiff, the Court construes the Motion as a notice filed pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i). That subsection allows a plaintiff to “dismiss an action without a court order by filing [] a notice of dismissal before the opposing party serves either an answer or a motion for summary judgment.” Plaintiff’s filing is a self-executing and no further action by the Court is required as to these Defendants. *See Janssen v. Harris*, 321 F.3d 998, 1000 (10th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s claims against John and Jane Doe are dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 11th day of December, 2024.

¹ As set forth in the Motion, “[t]he Doe Defendants were joined as occupants of the Property,” but the property is vacant. Mot. ¶ 3.



SCOTT L. PALK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE